DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 478 623 SP 041 659

AUTHOR	Canniff, Julie G.; Shank, Melody J.
TITLE	If You Do What You Always Did, You Get What You Always Got: Portland SST Transforming School Cultures through a Seamless Continuum of Teacher Professional Development.
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teacher Induction; College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Mentors; Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Teacher Associations
IDENTIFIERS	Portland Public Schools ME

ABSTRACT

The Portland Public Schools, Maine, a small, diverse urban district, partnered with the Portland Education Association and the University of Southern Maine's College of Education and Human Development to pilot Strengthening and Sustaining Teachers (SST), part of a national effort to link preservice teacher education in a continuum with veteran professional development. Planners developed a beginning teacher induction program at one elementary and one high school. Over time, more schools have become involved. Researchers evaluated the Portland SST, presenting findings through three case studies that examined: processes required to build a truly shared partnership between the college, school district, and teacher's association; history and current condition of the university's teacher certification program; and the two schools' design and implementation processes. Results revealed that different phases of the continuum were not linked during the first 2 years. The induction program did not build on all of the structures underlying the university's teacher education programs. With the exception of mentor training, SST and the district's existing certification mentoring program were not solidly linked. Building administrators' voices were diminished in induction program design and implementation, which created problems for new teachers primarily around scheduling. Nonetheless, the project continues to build new relationships and stronger partnerships as participants become more committed to embedding teacher development into collaborative school and district cultures. (Contains 23 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 478 623

If You Do What You Always Did, You Get What You Always Got:

Portland SST transforming school cultures through a seamless continuum of teacher professional development.

Julie G. Canniff, Ed. D.
University of Southern Maine
(jcanniff@usm.maine.edu)

Melody J. Shank, Ph.D.
University of Southern Maine
mshank@usm.maine.edu

Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association
Chicago Illinois
April 21-25, 2003

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Julie Canniff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP041659

Introduction

The current state of teacher development, from preservice education through the fifth year of teaching, lacks coherence both in vision and in practice. Too often the obvious partners in teacher development – institutions of higher education, school systems and teachers unions – don't plan and work together to give teachers the type of preparation and support that foster teaching excellence. Neither do they focus on the environments in which teachers work to create more collaborative structures for teacher learning. Few links exist between teacher preparation programs, induction programs and ongoing professional development. Often this leaves individual school districts with the responsibility of trying to devise a one-size-fits all teacher development program. Professional development can range from the largely practical needs of the first year teacher to the needs of the veteran teacher whose focus includes mastery of content along with an increasing interest in leadership roles within the building or the district.

In 1999, Dr. Pat Wasley currently the Dean of Education at the University of Washington, enlisted John Goodlad from the Institute for Educational Inquiry (IEI), Adam Urbansky, founder of the Teacher Union Reform Network (TURN), and Fred Frelow of the National Commission on Teachers and America's Future (NCTAF) in launching the Strengthening and Sustaining Teachers (SST) project. The project was envisioned as a national effort to link preservice teacher education in a continuum with veteran professional development. A National Coordinating Council, made up of representatives of these sponsoring organizations, was appointed to oversee the selection of a few professional development school sites, and to provide ongoing technical and intellectual support to the sites.

Expanding upon John Goodlad's professional development school partnership model, the overarching goal of SST is to strengthen and sustain the continuum between three different, context sensitive systems of teacher development. The Portland Public Schools (PPS) in Maine, a small urban district with a highly diverse student population, was invited in 1999, along with its partnering institutions, the Portland Education Association (PEA) and the University of Southern

Maine's (USM) College of Education and Human Development, to be one of the initial pilot sites. USM's College of Education and Human Development has a long history of partnering with regional school districts to implement high quality teacher education programs. For over ten years the Portland Public Schools and USM have grappled with the best programmatic approaches for training pre-service teachers in the ever-changing landscape of teaching, learning and schooling. It is within this tradition of collaborative work that these two institutions joined together with the teachers union to design and implement a connected approach to teacher development.

After agreeing to be an SST site, the three partners (PPS, USM, PEA) outlined the following goals:

1. To redesign each of the individual components of teacher development -- preservice education, induction programs and professional development opportunities; and
2. To build a seamless continuum between and among the three phases in order to ensure rigorous, coherent teacher development.
3. To transform school cultures by empowering new relationships, roles and responsibilities among teacher education faculty, mentor teachers, teacher leaders, school and district administrators.

As John Goodlad stated, "this program is aimed at creating exemplars of teacher development with the. . . capacity to get to the 'deeper structure' of schooling, to move society past the old regularities of schooling. . ."

Prior to developing a proposal for the SST grant in 2000, the District Steering Committee (DSC) made up of the university dean, the president of the teachers union, and the director of educational planning for the school district sought input from university faculty, district administrators, former graduates of the teacher education programs, union and non-union teachers through an extensive series of focus groups, dinner discussions, and interviews. Evidence from these discussions revealed that there was very little understanding of the philosophical and practical connections between the pre-service intern's experience and the induction experiences for first and second year teachers. The process of veteran teachers helping new teachers through their two year

probationary period to a continuing contract and a professional certificatea process mandated by the state and involving the setting of goals and three classroom observationswas not perceived as mentoring in the way that veteran teachers mentored student interns in USM's Extended Teacher Education Program. Additionally, professional development for teachers with three to five years in the district was largely an individual path, primarily pursued through external courses and workshops. Portland's schools have a long history of site-based decision-making, and each building interprets teacher leadership roles differently. While over 80% of teachers in the district are members of the Portland Education Association, the union is not, historically, perceived as being influential in defining paths for professional development.

Based on the collected data, the SST District Steering committee decided to target the development of an induction program as its first step in creating a seamless teacher development program. Two schools within the school district an elementary school and one of the three high schools agreed to be pilot sites for the induction program. A design team from each of the schools worked during the first two years of the project to outline the particular roles and procedures for the support of new teachers in each building. A third design team worked on issues related to ETEP in Portland for one year only. The induction program was implemented at the pilot sites during the 2001-2002 school year. The number of new teachers was smallonly sixbut the pilot gave the District Steering Committee the opportunity to work through many of the structural and philosophical roadblocks of creating a teacher development program in which the teachers union, the school district and the university have equal responsibility for its success.

Today, five more schools are involved and the image of the continuum envisioned by the District Steering committee is now mirrored in the buildings. Each building has integrated one of three pre-service teacher education programs (the university also has an education minor) into the school culture, and a Building Steering Committee (BSC), comprised of a building administrator and two teacher leaders who are union members, oversees the established induction mentoring program for its school. A few buildings have also implemented collaborative groups such as Critical Friends as an option for veteran teachers' professional development.

The material for this paper is drawn from our first evaluation report of SST in Portland - Strengthening and Sustaining Teachers: Portland Evaluation Report, Years One and Two. The findings in the report are described through three interlocking case studies. One case focuses on the process required to build a truly shared partnership between USM's college of education, the school district and the teacher's association. A second case describes the history and current condition of USM's teacher certification programs. A third case is concerned primarily with the two pilot schools -- design process and implementation phases of the induction program for the six new teachers during the 2001-2002 school year.

We frame our discussion for this paper within the larger concept of the continuum, and the related concept of the professional collaborative culture. As stated above, it is our belief that educators working in a professional culture where teacher professional development is viewed as seamless approach problems that arise about teacher quality or student achievement as a shared concern. If students should have consistent support in reaching learning goals and standards, then teaching interns and beginning teachers should be supported in a similar manner. If reflection and inquiry are critical thinking skills for students, then teachers at every phase of their development should have opportunities to inquire into and reflect on their beliefs and practices.

This paper reveals that different phases of the continuum were not linked during the first two years of SST. The induction program did not build on all of the structures that underlie USM's teacher education programs; with the exception of mentor training, the SST induction program and the district's existing certification mentoring program were not solidly linked; the voices of building administrators were diminished in the design and implementation of the induction program which led to a number of problems for new teachers primarily around scheduling. Nonetheless, the project has continued to build new relationships and stronger partnerships as the participants become more and more committed to embedding teacher development into collaborative school and district cultures.

Theoretical Framework

SST draws on the legacy of scholars who write about professional learning communities and who have contributed to the research on transformative school cultures, collaborative inquiry into teaching practices, and the impact this context has on student learning (Feiman-Nemser 1990; Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1999; Darling-Hammond 1999; Darling-Hammond and Sykes 1999; Feiman-Nemser 2000, January; Feiman-Nemser 2001, January/February), (Lave and Wenger 1991; Johnson, Birkeland et al. 2001, July/August; Johnson and Kardos 2002, March; Katz and Feiman-Nemser 2002, September), (Lee and Smith 1996), (Little 1990; Little 1992; Little 1993; Lieberman 1995; Lieberman 1996; Lieberman 1997), (McLaughlin and Talbert 1993; McLaughlin and Talbert 2001), (Wasley 1992; Wasley, Hampel et al. 1997; Wenger 1998). What links them is the conviction that authentic professional development happens on site; it is situated in the everyday work of teachers as they strive to engage students in meaningful learning. When teachers are engaged in learning as a part of their practice, students are more likely to achieve (Lieberman, 1997). What teachers do together outside of the classroom matters.

Pat Wasley in Strengthening and Sustaining Teachers, March 2000, a report prepared for the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as Profession cites a number of studies which point to the strong relationship between high student achievement and "well prepared, intellectually curious teachers (1)." The Holmes Group, the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) and the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) all emphasize the need to involve teachers in the arduous and complex process of reforming school cultures and expectations for students. Research has shown that teachers who have ongoing opportunities to develop a varied instructional repertoire in concert with expertise in designing standards-based assessments have a positive effect on student motivation and retention (Darling-Hammond and Sykes 1999), (Wasley, Hampel et al. 1997).

Sharon Feiman-Nemser in From Preparation to Practice: Designing a Continuum to Strengthen and Sustain Teaching, (January 2000), commissioned by the SST Project, lays out an integrated set of elements that are part of a developmental strategy for teacher professional development. Feiman-

Nemser claims that developing one's expertise as a teachers includes constructing a personal teaching philosophy/identity; mastering an instructional repertoire, building a body of evidence through a professional portfolio, and participating in communities of practice where teachers, through collaborative inquiry groups, learn to critique their practice, collaborate with colleagues on common assessments, and assume leadership positions in the work of professional reform.

Ultimately, the conversation about changing the culture is a reform agenda. When you change the ways school leaders interact with each other as well as the strategies district administrators use to support new teachers, you are reforming the culture. This can lead to discomfort and conflict. Having outside critical friends; having partners can help expand the view of teacher learning and student learning. Partnerships help us challenge beliefs and norms.

Research Design

The documentation of this project revolves around a number of interlocking case studies. Data collection and analysis for the first three years has concentrated on three cases -- the partnership among the university, the district and the union, the teacher education programs, and the district's new induction (mentoring) program. The research questions that guided the documentation of these three cases were provided by the National Coordinating Council for the SST project.

Question #1: What does a teacher education program look like that is focused on helping prepare teachers for their first two years?

Question #2: How do project sites connect pre-service to induction?

Question #3: What does an induction program look like when it builds on pre-service content and experiences, and when it focuses on providing powerful support for the first two years?

Research Participants

Research participants include the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development, the Director of Educational Planning for Portland Public Schools and the President of the Portland Education Association; the design teams for the two pilot schools (total of 20 people); all teachers

new to the district in 2001-2002 (total of 65); first and second year teachers and their mentors at the two pilot schools (total of 12 people).

Data Collection

The data collection began in 1999 with the focus groups and dinner discussions with Portland administrators, USM faculty, former ETEP interns, union and non-union teachers with regard to teacher preparation and support. Data from the SST District Steering Committee include transcripts of monthly meetings, quarterly visits from Coordinating Council members and semi-annual meetings of the Portland and Seattle site. Data on the induction program include written observations from mentoring pairs at the two pilot schools, interviews with key pilot school leaders, focus group interviews with mentors, and surveys of first and second year teachers.

Data Analysis Methods

To analyze the data we framed analytical questions keyed to the research questions and reviewed literature to focus our coding of documents and transcripts. We used Hyperesearch ©, a qualitative research software, to review all transcribed material and identify generative codes. We displayed them in a thematic matrix to capture enduring themes within cases and across cases. Narrative summaries synthesize themes and present each case. Quantitative analysis was conducted on survey data, as well as data on new teacher statistics including the number of new teachers, degrees held, certificate held, grade level, subject

Setting and History

Portland Public School (PPS) serves approximately 7500 students taught by a staff of nearly 800 teachers. There are seventeen schools within the district, many of which are neighborhood schools. Like many urban school systems the student population is declining while at the same time the district is experiencing a rise in the ESOL, Special Education and Chapter One student population. The ethnic make-up of the Portland student body reveals that 7.3 percent of the students are Asian,

8.7 percent are African-American, .5 percent are American Indian, 2 percent are Hispanic, and 81.5 percent are Caucasian. In addition, the number of students eligible for free and reduced lunch has increased with six out of seven Chapter One eligible schools serving a student body of which 50% of the students qualify for free and reduced lunch; three of those schools serve a population of which over 90% qualify.

Currently, approximately one-third of Portland's teaching staff has over 25 years of service and is eligible to retire. While PPS has not hired first year teachers historically, the data for academic year 2001-2002 shows that 25% of the new teachers are being hired with no prior teaching experience. The greatest need is finding qualified teachers in the areas of foreign language, math, science, and special education.

The Portland Public Schools began its decade long relationship as a Professional Development School in the 1980s when it served as one of three sites for a Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education teacher certification program through the University of Southern Maine. During this period, the district was also a site for a secondary alternative teacher certification program during this period. After these programs were discontinued in 1991, Portland became a site for the Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP), USM's graduate level teacher certification program. In 1998, USMs new undergraduate teacher certification program Teachers for Elementary and Middle Schools (TEAMS) began working with site teachers to create field opportunities for university students. The two programs operate with steering committees made up of university and school faculty and administrators. ETEP/Portland enrolls 20 to 25 interns each year and is administered by two site coordinators, one who is a full-time university faculty member and the other is an employee of the Portland schools. TEAMS currently accepts 15 to 20 undergraduate K-8 candidates into the formal internship part of the program. Portland's history as a partner with the university was vital to developing the links between the phases of teacher development.

Research Findings and Discussion

A central concept of the SST project is building the "connective tissue" necessary to support teachers through the stages of teaching, particularly pre-service through the first five years (Wasley 2000, March). Conceptualizing the structural, cultural, and practical conditions necessary for supporting teachers is the first step in building this tissue, but reforming the roles, relationships and responsibilities of key people and creating new practices are more important. Seamlessness between the stages of teacher development requires doing things differently.

For the first two years of the project, Portland grappled with these concepts at three levels–constructing solid connections between the three SST partners (the university, the district and the union); connecting the teacher certification programs at the university to the district induction program; and finally, connecting the new induction program to the structures of the district and individual school cultures. Members of the National SST Coordinating Council continued to remind the Portland SST coalition to build each stage of the emerging program on the previous one and to persist in confronting the privacy, autonomy and non-interference of the teaching culture. But this was not easy; unanticipated stumbling blocks and missed opportunities came into play.

Our observations of the Portland SST project's success at addressing these ideas are organized into three themes: a) the teacher preparation and professional development programs were both connected and disconnected; b) induction is a holistic, situated, and individualistic process, and c) relationships transform culture.

Connections and Disconnections between the Pre-service Teacher Preparation and the Professional Development Programs

In the design stages of the project, the voices and presence of all three partner organizations were quite evident, but once the SST Steering Committee decided that new teacher induction would be the initial target of the project, the voice of the teachers association became stronger and the focus on pre-service preparation moved to the background. The voice of the district in its administrative role also took a back seat making the way for the association president and the participating union

members to mold the future induction program. The Dean of the College of Education and Human Development (who was not a teacher educator) was the sole university representative on the SST Steering Committee. Consequently, neither the redesign efforts within the pre-service programs, happening simultaneously with the development of the induction program, nor the linkage between the pre-service and induction programs, were central to the committee's discussions. As a result, the induction program did not build on the practices of the pre-service program. Rather, it was more closely modelled after the conventional certification credentialing process with which the designers had more familiarity. The designers of the pilot projects therefore missed three opportunities to connect the pre-service program to the induction program.

First of all, USM's teacher preparation programs are built on a set of structures that ideally create a culture of inquiry and collegiality. After an intern orientation that emphasizes collaboration, reflection and risk-taking, an intern year is framed by an assessment system that includes developing personal teaching philosophies, learning how to plan lessons and teaching units, becoming reflective practitioners, and providing evidence of teaching competencies through a professional portfolio according to a set of twelve standards, along with a predictable sequence of goal-setting conferences with the intern and the mentor teacher. The induction program did not build on this solid structure.

Secondly, the twelve teaching standards USM's teacher preparation programs utilize as the basis for assessing intern performance were not linked with Portland Public School's set of teaching standards. ETEP and TEAMS mentors focus all of their goal setting and exit conferences around a subset of these standards, so that the intern, over the year, knows that they are developing satisfactorily in the area of content knowledge and inquiry for instance, but need more work in the areas of classroom management or instructional planning.

In contrast, the district certification mentoring process is designed to help new teachers advance from a provisional or conditional certificate to a professional certificate and provides minimal mentoring feedback and support. It is built on five broad categories of teaching practice, and is structured by three classroom observations conducted by the mentor, and the drafting and successful

completion of a Teacher Action Plan. SST mentors, who were also acting as certification mentors did not appear to connect a framework of standards to their observations or conversations with their mentees. Many of them intuitively sensed that classroom organization, discipline and instructional strategies would be a weakness for beginning teachers, but were not guided to gather evidence around a set of standards. The SST mentors thus framed their practice as a mentor on their unique stance toward mentoring (proactive or responsive), on professional experience, or their perception of what good teaching is in their context.

A final missed opportunity to connect the practical wisdom of the pre-service programs to the induction program was in the support of new teachers in the pilot schools who were conditionally certified. The SST mentors of these teachers (teacher who had not completed a teacher education program) found themselves confronting issues such as confidence and self-esteem, struggles with establishing a classroom climate, and confusion over curriculum and assessment issues common to pre-service teacher interns. Conditional and targeted needs teachers are in a sense "border-crossers;" they do not fit well on a smooth continuum between pre-service and induction. They are true novices to the art and practice of teaching and yet have their own classrooms and all the responsibilities of the full-time professional. Conditional and targeted needs teachers do not come to the classroom with a foundation for reflection about their practice and experience with collaboration that are common among ETEP and TEAMS interns. Mentoring these teachers is more similar to mentoring pre-service interns than new teachers. The expertise of long-time ETEP mentors could have been beneficial to these SST mentors, as the ETEP mentors would understand the specific needs of these "in-service interns" and could provide guidance in helping SST mentors structure the new teachers' learning. These missed opportunities represent the disconnections between the pre-service and professional development programs in the project.

The successful mentor training and support is one example of productive connective tissue between the pre-service and induction programs. The District's school-based ETEP site coordinator collaborated closely with the TEAMS Coordinator to design and facilitate a three-part mentor training program, *The Foundations of Mentoring*, for all teachers mentoring in the district. By the

beginning of the 2001-02 school year, all SST and ETEP mentors had completed the training along with some TEAMS and district certification mentors. A handbook of guidelines for mentor teachers, *Portland Public School Mentoring*, which included an extensive collection of forms and formats for goal setting, observation, and analysis of student work, was given to all SST and ETEP mentors in the fall 2001. The training and the materials provided common expectations and guidelines for mentors of teachers across the pre-service-induction border.

Additionally, commonly structured, but separately-held cohort meetings for both SST mentors and ETEP supervisors were facilitated during the 2001-2002 school year. (ETEP supervisors are building-based and collaborate with the university and district site-coordinators to monitor the mentoring pairs in each building). The SST mentors met quarterly after school, while the ETEP supervisors met monthly. The ETEP meetings had greater success, due primarily to the fact that they could meet during the school day and were working with already existing protocols and structures of the program. The SST mentors, operating under various school release times, had difficulty maintaining their motivation to attend the meetings. With that said, all SST mentors found the cohort meetings at least somewhat profitable because the meetings provided them the opportunity to address issues and build common language around their practice as mentors.

Induction as a holistic process

Although the focus of the SST work for Year Two was on establishing an *induction* program in Portland, negotiating the tasks and procedures of the *mentoring* component became all consuming. Negotiations between the union, the district, and building administrators regarding compensation and criteria for choosing SST mentors, and release time, differentiated work loads for both SST mentors and new teachers, were more consuming than anticipated. Additionally, key district-level administrators were slow to understand the need for aligning structures like schedules as a way of supporting new teachers. It took time to shift the conversation from accepting the inevitability of teacher turn-over to one of increasing teacher quality and cost effectiveness by actively retaining new teachers.

Viewed broadly, induction begins with the hiring process and continues as new teachers learn the ropes of the district and school through formal (orientation, mentoring, scheduled meetings) and informal means (daily collegial interaction, spontaneously organized working teams, and the practices and structures of the schools). If too much focus is placed on a formal mentoring program and not on changing the whole school environment, then many opportunities to influence teachers' practice can be missed.

In order to create a community of practice where teacher development is the responsibility of the whole school community, Portland's Induction Program needs to be aware of and connect all of the formal and informal support structures through a set of valued cultural norms for teaching. If new teachers are expected to engage in an ongoing cycle of collegial inquiry–posing questions of practice with colleagues, being observed, getting feedback, implementing feedback–then such practices much be imbedded in the school culture. In other words, veteran teachers must practise what is expected of new teachers. Hence, the whole school community should have a process for making judgements about standards and qualities of good teaching. These cultural norms are created through focused conversations and established expectations and structures, and based in relationships.

Relationships Transform Culture

One of the most enduring outcomes of the first two years of SST in Portland is the affirmation that relationships are central to transforming culture. Tom Gillette captures the tone of this theme by referring to the experience of Teacher Union Reform Network (TURN) in Rochester,

> As Rochester headed down the collaborative road, both sides said the old way of doing things doesn't work, so the district and association needed to change practices to make it work. Here is one of our favourite catch phrases, "if you always do what you always did, you always get what you always got." [We had to] look at developing different relationships such as the Union sharing professional development issues and to force that responsibility where it belong[ed] (personal communication).

New relationships, and thus the foundation for cultural transformation, were forged in Portland between members of the three partner organisations, between the partner organisations and building principals, and at the building level between new teachers, SST mentors and other nearby colleagues.

Between the partner organizations. The relationship among the District Steering Committee partners deepened as these three colleagues became more skilful at seeing the roadblocks, manoeuvring around them, and maintaining their focus on the path ahead. As they encountered conflicts and missteps, the democratic process established early in the relationship meant that all perspectives were heard and considered. However, at each transition from design stage, to pilot school implementation, to expanding to five new buildings, the partners were faced with new expectations for how they represented their individual constituencies -- the union president needed to articulate a rationale for why teacher leaders serving on the Building Steering Committee would evaluate the SST mentors who were their peers; the district had to focus on the issue of scheduling and the use of district release days, and the university dean needed to include members of the teacher education faculty in the planning meetings.

Between the partner organizations and building principals. The extraordinary effort by the District Steering Committee (DSC) to take the SST project "to scale," depended exclusively on transforming the relationships among the DSC, district administrators, the building principals and the teachers association. Ultimately it came down to whether the building principals trusted the union to select the best teachers to be a part of the Building Steering Committees (BSC). The BSC is a radical departure for the buildings in that the selection, evaluation and support of all building SST mentors is shared among two teachers (who are union members) and an administrator. In practice, this means that the two teachers on the BSC are responsible for supervising and "evaluating" the SST mentor and the *quality of that mentoring* with the new teacher, while the administrator evaluates the *teaching expertise* of the new teacher. If the administrator found serious problems with the new

teacher's performance, it threw into question the ability of the SST mentor to give constructive, but critical coaching.

At the school level. As was confirmed in the survey and interview data, supportive relationships, whether provided by a colleague, mentor, or grade-level team, were the most significant in bringing new teachers into the building culture. The colleagues or SST mentors "helped them meet other colleagues," and were "somebody to talk to in times of need." Each SST mentor in the two pilot schools played a role as coach and advocate, and over time most of them evolved close relationships with their mentees. Because three of the new teachers were math teachers, the mentoring relationship also became a department responsibility, and gradually transformed the dynamics within that department. Typical of a community of practice, the veterans helped the "novices" move from the periphery of the culture, into the centre by developing relationships based on shared philosophies and shared expertise. In a few cases, the SST mentor-mentee relationship matured to the point where they made opportunities to team teach or develop joint lessons. Like strong professional communities they have assumed a collective responsibility to make sure all students achieved (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001).

Conclusion

In her research on new teachers in Massachusetts, Susan Moore Johnson describes the "integrated professional culture" as the kind of culture that sustains new teachers and integrates them as valuable members of the faculty. In such a culture,

> New teachers could expect frequent and meaningful interaction among faculty members across all experience levels, and an appropriate novice status that accounted for their developmental needs while not underestimating their potential contributions. In addition, responsibility for the school and its students was shared among all colleagues within the school (Johnson et al., 2001, July/August, pg. 2).

In the third year of the project, Portland SST began to institutionalise many of the structures piloted in Year Two. That process depended on increasing the awareness of the SST vision in each school, and beginning the challenging work of developing "integrative professional cultures" among faculty and administrators.

SST in Portland began with a strong spirit of partnership manifested through a process that included the voices of beginning and veteran teachers, Association members, ETEP interns and graduates, university faculty, and administrators. Both pilot schools included teachers and administrators in designing and implementing their plans for an induction program. Nonetheless, as the project unfolded, mentors, Steering Committee members, researchers and others found that new relationships needed to be built with the staff in the Central Office Human Resources department, cluster coordinators in the high schools, members of the Teacher Education faculty, ETEP and TEAMS advisory boards, and the district certification governance board. It became obvious that each entity had a role in envisioning and changing vital structures for supporting teacher development. Institutionalising SST will require building strong networks across all of these communities and a commitment to maintain an inclusive, ongoing conversation.

Collaborative conversations across the partner organisations regarding preparation of pre-service and conditionally certified teachers also need to intensify. Teacher preparation is becoming much more complex. USM currently has two teacher certification programs, one for undergraduates (TEAMS) and one for graduate students (ETEP). The college is under pressure to expand their programs to accommodate a growing number of alternative certificate holders, as well as a steady number of people with baccalaureate degrees who are financially or personally unable to participate in ETEP's intensive one-year program. State certification requirements are also changing. The AARBEC grant (Advancing the Agenda for Results-Based Educator Certification) is designing a new teacher certification process that will be performance-and standards-based. Teachers with provisional, conditional or targeted needs certificates will no longer patch together a random selection of courses to meet state requirements, but will need to document their competence in areas such as classroom instruction, assessment, knowledge of child or adolescent development,

exceptionality, and classroom management. New structures of education and support will need to be designed.

Institutionalising SST in this dimension requires that the induction program, more specifically mentoring, needs be responsive to *individual* needs of new teachers and be prepared to help the inductees develop a reflective stance toward his or her practice. It is critical that SST mentor pairs *focus on an explicit set of teaching standards*, and recognise that each inductee comes with a different level of preparation. For inductees with conditional or targeted needs certificates, the SST mentor will need to approach the candidate much as the ETEP mentor approaches her or his intern -- as someone who needs entry-level guidance in classroom management, discipline, instructional strategies and planning. For inductees with provisional certificates, the SST mentor will be more involved in helping the individual deepen her or his repertoire and professional stance.

Finally, the concept of "induction" is much larger than a one-on-one mentoring program. Induction is happening throughout the school context where individuals are becoming part of a community of practice and being oriented to ways of being in this particular place. Institutionalisation of SST in this dimension will require each building to see itself as a collaborative culture in which mentoring happens through multiple means and interactions. We envision a collaborative culture in which veteran teachers share their practice through collegial groups, mentors meet with one another to share their experiences with pre-service interns or with first year teachers, and mentoring occurs when beginning teachers share their practice with their peers as well as with more experienced teachers.

References

Cochran-Smith, M. and S. L. Lytle (1999). "Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities." Review of Research in Education **24**: 249-305.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Educating teachers for the next century: Rethinking practice and policy. The Education of Teachers. G. Griffin, 98th NSSE Yearbook. **1**: 221-256.

Darling-Hammond, L. and G. Sykes, Eds. (1999). Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of policy and practice. California, Jossey-Bass.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. Handbook of research on teacher education. W. R. Houston. New York, Macmillan: 212-233.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2000, January). From Preparation to Practice: Designing a Continuum to Strengthen and Sustain Teaching. Bank Street College, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, the Teacher Union Reform Network, National Network for Educational Renewal, Strengthening and Sustaining Teaching Project: 1-63.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001, January/February). "Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher." Journal of Teacher Education **52**(1): 17-30.

Johnson, S. M., S. Birkeland, et al. (2001, July/August). "Retaining the next generation of teachers: The importance of school-based support." Harvard Education Letter: Research Online.

Johnson, S. M. and S. M. Kardos (2002, March). "Keeping New Teachers in Mind." Educational Leadership **59**(6): 12-16.

Katz, D. and S. Feiman-Nemser (2002, September). Embedding New Teacher Induction in a Culture of Professional Development. Seattle, WA, Institute for Educational Inquiry: 1-12.

Lave, J. and E. Wenger (1991). Situated Learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Palo Alto, CA, Institute for Research on Learning.

Lee, V. and J. Smith (1996). "Collective responsibility for learning and its effects on gains in achievement for early secondary school students." American Journal of Education **104**: 103-147.

Lieberman, A. (1995). "Practices that support teacher development: Transforming conceptions of professional learning." Phi Delta Kappan **76**(8): 591-6.

Lieberman, A., Ed. (1996). Practices that support teacher development. Teacher learning: New policies, new practices. New York, Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. (1997). Remarks about symposium, Supporting teachers and community: Theories of action in four reform movements. American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Il.

Little, J. W. (1990). "The "mentor" phenomenon and the social organization of teaching." Review of Research in Education **16**: 297-351.

Little, J. W. (1992). Opening the Black Box of Professional Community. The Changing Contexts of Teaching. A. Lieberman. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. **Part I**.

Little, J. W. (1993). "Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform." Educational Evaluation and Policy **15**(2): 129-151.

McLaughlin, M. W. and J. E. Talbert (1993). Contexts that Matter for Teaching and Learning. Palo Alto, CA, Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School.

McLaughlin, M. W. and J. E. Talbert (2001). Professional Communities and the work of high school teaching. Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press.

Wasley, P., R. Hampel, et al., Eds. (1997). Kids and school reform. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Wasley, P. A. (1992). Teacher leadership in a teacher-run school. The Changing Contexts of Teaching. A. Lieberman. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. **Part I**.

Wasley, P. A. (2000, March). Strengthening and Sustaining Teachers. New York, Bank Street College of Education: 1-36.

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of Practice: Learning, meaning and identity. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: If you do what you always did, you get what you always got: Portland SST transforming school cultures through a seamless continuum of teacher professional development

Author(s): Julie G. Canniff, Ed.D. Melody J. Shank, Ph.D.

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: April, 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

X

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Julie G. Canniff	Printed Name/Position/Title: Julie G. Canniff, Clinical Instructor
Organization/Address: 505 Bailey Hall USM Gorham, Me. 04038	Telephone: 207-228-8324 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: jcanniff@usm.maine.edu Date: 6-9-03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org